

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 1 September 2004. Responsive to the objections and rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1, 5 and 7 have been amended to correct the language thereof and the combination of elements which form the invention of the subject Patent Application. Additionally, Claim 6 has been amended to correct an informality therein and Claims 2 – 3 have been cancelled by this Amendment.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), because the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner stated that the lattice called for in Claim 3 must be shown or the feature cancelled from the claims.

Claim 3 has been cancelled by this Amendment, thereby obviating any change to the drawings.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5), because they included the reference numeral “114” not described in the Specification.

A correct and formal drawing of Fig. 2 is enclosed which replaces the mis-designated reference numeral “114” with the proper reference numeral -- 112 --, which is described in the Specification.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure due to a number of grammatical errors found therein. Accordingly, the Specification has been amended to correct the grammatical errors found therein. No new matter has been added by these changes.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 2, 3, and 6 due to informalities therein and rejected Claims 1 – 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner indicated a number of limitations which were unclear or inaccurate.

Claims 1, 5, 6, and 7 have been amended to correct the language thereof. It is now believed that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over Ness, U.S. Patent No. 2,160,278, in view of Tam, U.S. Patent No. 6,705,833. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over Ness and Tam, and further in view of Emery, U.S. Patent No. 1,364,360. However, the Examiner kindly indicated that Claims 2 and 5 – 7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 2 therein, thereby effectively rewriting Claim 2 in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim, Claim 1, and any intervening claims, which there were none. Thus, Claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon, Claims 4 and 8, should now be allowable.

Claims 5 and 7 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 1 therein, thereby rewriting those claims in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim, original Claim 1, and any intervening claims, which there were none. Thus, Claims 5 and 7 should also now be allowable.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For RÖSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 22 Dec. 2004

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678

Customer No.
04586

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached drawing sheet includes a change to Fig. 2. The sheet, which includes the amended drawing of Fig. 2 replaces the original sheet that includes Fig. 2 thereon. In Fig. 2, the previously misidentified reference numeral “114” has been replaced with the corrected numeral -- 112 --, which is described in the Specification.

Attachment: One replacement sheet